Prepared for submission to JHEP

FERMILAB-PUB-15-573-T

Running after Diphoton

Jiayin Gu[1a] **, Zhen Liu**[2b]

[a] *Center for Future High Energy Physics, Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

[b] *Theoretical Physics Department, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL, 60510*

Abstract: A very plausible explanation for the recently observed diphoton excess at the 13 TeV LHC is a (pseudo)scalar with mass around 750 GeV, which couples to a gluon pair and to a photon pair through loops involving vector-like quarks (VLQs). To accommodate the observed rate, the required Yukawa couplings tend to be large. A large Yukawa coupling would rapidly run up with the scale and quickly reach the perturbativity bound, indicating that new physics, possibly with a strong dynamics origin, is near by. The case becomes stronger especially if the ATLAS observation of a large width persists. In this paper we study the implication on the scale of new physics from the 750 GeV diphoton excess using the method of renormalization group running with careful treatment of different contributions and perturbativity criterion. Our results suggest that the scale of new physics is generically not much larger than the TeV scale, in particular if the width of the hinted (pseudo)scalar is large. Introducing multiple copies of VLQs, lowing the VLQ masses and enlarging VLQ electric charges help reduce the required Yukawa couplings and can push the cutoff scale to higher values. Nevertheless, if the width of the 750 GeV resonance turns out to be larger than about 1 GeV, it is very hard to increase the cutoff scale beyond a few TeVs. This is a strong hint that new particles in addition to the 750 GeV resonance and the vector-like quarks should be around the TeV scale.

arXiv:1512.07624v3 [hep-ph] 25 Jan 2016

[1]Email: gujy@ihep.ac.cn

[2]Email: zliu2@fnal.gov

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Diphoton excess from $gg \to S \to \gamma\gamma$ **2**

3 Perturbative considerations with RG running **7**

4 Implication of new physics scale in various VLQ models **8**

5 Conclusion **13**

1 Introduction

The ATLAS and CMS collaborations have recently announced the observation of an excess in the diphoton channel at around 750 GeV with the first crop of data from 13 TeV LHC [1, 2]. Many have speculated it to be the first hint of physics Beyond the Standard Model (BSM). A huge amount of efforts from the theory community has been put on possible explanations and implications of this excess [3–84]. The majority of these studies involve a scalar or a pseudoscalar (usually denoted as S) with mass around 750 GeV, which couples to gluon pair and to photon pair through loops with vector-like quarks (VLQ), despite a few exceptions. These explanations require large coefficients c_g and c_γ for the anomalous Sgg and $S\gamma\gamma$ couplings. Such large coefficients usually in turns require large Yukawa coupling between S and the VLQs. In many cases this large coupling makes the theory already non-perturbative, indicating the invalidity of the assumed underlying BSM theory. Even if the Yukawa coupling is below the perturbativity bound at 750 GeV, a sufficiently large Yukawa coupling will run up rapidly with scale. In this case the cutoff scale Λ of the minimal theory, around which additional new physics needs to appear, can not be much larger than a few TeV.

In this paper, we study the implication of the scale of new physics from the 750 GeV diphoton excess by performing Rormalization Group (RG) running of the Yukawa couplings. We explore different methods to increase the cutoff scale (thereby "postpone" the appearance of new physics). These methods include introducing multiple copies of VLQs, VLQ with light masses, and VLQ with large electric charges. In addition, we consider different assumptions on the total decay width of the resonance, especially a relatively large width as preferred by the ATLAS results. In Section 2, we study the diphoton excess assuming the process $gg \to S \to \gamma\gamma$ account for all observed diphoton rate and derive the bounds on the couplings c_g and c_γ for different assumptions on the properties of the new (pseudo)scalar S and the VLQs. In Section 3, we write down the RG equation of the Yukawa coupling and derive the

cutoff scale with analytic method. In Section 4, we perform a more careful numerical study and present the results for different cases. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Diphoton excess from $gg \to S \to \gamma\gamma$

The observed cross section by combining both experiments at 8 TeV and 13 TeV under the assumption of gg-fusion production for a resonance S is estimated to be [7, 13, 67]

$$\sigma(pp \to S) \times \mathrm{Br}(\mathrm{S} \to \gamma\gamma) = 5.5 \pm 1.4 \text{ fb} \quad \text{at LHC } 13\,\text{TeV}. \tag{2.1}$$

We note here the acceptance times efficiency of the experiment is estimated at around 80% from our simulation and is used in obtaining the above result. Our estimation of the acceptance times signal efficiency is consistent with the ATLAS description [2]. The simplest model for such diphoton excess is a singlet scalar couples to gluon pair and photon pair through loop-induced anomalous couplings[1]. We consider the following effective Lagrangian in the broken phase of electroweak symmetry of a scalar (pseudoscalar) s (a) [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^s &\supset -c_g \frac{\alpha_s}{12\pi}\frac{s}{m_S} G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu} - c_\gamma \frac{\alpha}{6\pi}\frac{s}{m_S} F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}, \\ \mathcal{L}^a &\supset \tilde{c}_g \frac{\alpha_s}{8\pi}\frac{a}{m_S} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} G^{\mu\nu}G^{\alpha\beta} + \tilde{c}_\gamma \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\frac{a}{m_S} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\mu\nu}F^{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

We assume these couplings are generated by VLQ loops, which is the case in many plausible scenarios. The normalization of these coefficients in Eq. (2.2) are chosen such that their values basically correspond to the Yukawa couplings for a VLQ with its mass at $m_S = 750$ GeV for convenience. To be more specific, we have

$$c_g,\ \tilde{c}_g \ = \sum_i y_i \frac{m_S}{M_i} \bar{A}_{1/2}(\tau_i)\,, \tag{2.3}$$

$$c_\gamma,\ \tilde{c}_\gamma \ = \sum_i y_i N_c Q_i^2 \frac{m_S}{M_i} \bar{A}_{1/2}(\tau_i)\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where y_i, M_i, N_c and Q_i are the corresponding Yukawa coupling, mass, number of colored states and electric charge of a given VLQ state.[3] Function $\bar{A}_{1/2}(\tau_i)$ is the correction to the loop-function of the given VLQ, with $\tau_i \equiv m_S^2/(4M_i^2)$ and for $\tau_i < 1$ [87]

$$\bar{A}_{1/2}(\tau_i) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{3}{2\tau_i^2}\left(\tau_i + (\tau_i - 1)\arcsin^2\sqrt{\tau_i}\right) \approx 1 + \dfrac{7}{30\tau_i} + O(\tau_i^2), & \text{for } s \\ \dfrac{1}{\tau_i}\arcsin^2\sqrt{\tau_i} \approx 1 + \dfrac{1}{3\tau_i} + O(\tau_i^2), & \text{for } a. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

[1] The phenomenology of such effective models has also been discussed in different context before the observation of diphoton excess, see *e.g.* Ref. [85].

[2] Whenever possible, we use S to simplify discussions applicable for both scalar s and pseudoscalar a, as well as the case without ambiguities.

[3] We ignore any possible mixing between the VLQs and the SM quarks for simplicity. This mixing induces a coupling between the 750 GeV resonance and SM quarks. This coupling introduces multiple mass scales and is constrained by other searches. There also exist nontrivial bounds on the mixing between VLQs and the SM quarks, see *e.g.* Ref. [86] for a comprehensive study.



Figure 1. The absolute value of the fermion Loop-function corrections for scalar and pseudoscalar as defined in Eq.(2.5).

In Fig. 1 we show the absolute values of these loop-function corrections as a function of the VLQ mass M for a 750 GeV scalar particle. This demonstrates the size of near-threshold enhancement for the loop induced couplings. Comparing to the value of unity[4] in large M, the loop function could be enlarged to 1.5 (2.5) and 1.4 (1.7) for VLQ mass M 375 GeV and 400 GeV, respectively, for scalar (pseudoscalar). As we shall see later, the signal requires large values of loop induced scalar to gluon pair and to diphoton coupling. This near threshold effect is helpful in pushing up the cutoff scale of the theory. This motivates our benchmark VLQ mass of 1000 GeV and 400 GeV. The former represents asymptotic values of loop function for large mass; the latter represents the case where threshold effect is important without opening up the tree-level two-body decays to VLQ pairs.

Before moving on to numerical studies of the diphoton excess, we want to comment on alternative choices of the effective Lagrangian. Conventionally we use the set of higher dimensional operators assuming the preservation of SM gauge symmetries $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. It is not only a plausible requirement for most beyond stand model extensions, but also enables us to see the links between various modes after electroweak symmetry breaking. In such basis, the most relevant operators are O_B and O_W[5]. Our coefficient c_γ is in fact proportional to Wilson coefficient $c_B \cos^2\theta_W + c_W \sin^2\theta_W$. Furthermore, these operators also induce $S \to ZZ$, $Z\gamma$ and WW decays with explicit parametric dependence. Consequently, the future measurement of these relevant channels will provide new insight about the underlying theory, see discussions in *e.g.* Refs [7, 13, 81, 88]. However, our choice of parameterization does capture the essential physics for the diphoton anomaly, avoiding introducing more parameters

[4]This is due to our consistent choice of the coefficients in Eq.(2.2), Eq.(2.3) and Eq.(2.4).

[5]These operators are defined by replacing the FF in operators in Eq. (2.2) with BB and WW in the unbroken phase of electroweak gauge symmetry, and similarly for the pseudoscalar.

to the question. Additional direct decay channels will also dilute the diphoton branching fractions, and in turn require larger coefficients. Our approach is rather minimalistic and conservative. A simple choice of $SU(2)_L$ singlet VLQ will result in only inducing O_B but not O_W. It was shown explicitly that the diphoton partial width is larger than the widths to other weak bosons in such setup [19, 35, 89, 90], following $\Gamma_\gamma : \Gamma_{Z\gamma} : \Gamma_{ZZ} = 1 : 2\tan\theta_W^2 : \tan\theta_W^4$ where θ_W is the Weinberg angle. Other more complex models with VLQ charged under $SU(2)_L$ will lead to different relative strength of the $Z\gamma$, ZZ and WW partial widths, leading to interesting potential future searches to probe the underlying VLQ quantum numbers.

For general models with loop-induced scalar to gluon pair and photon pair coupling, one important feature is that the gluon pair partial width Γ_{gg} is about 400 times the diphoton partial width $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$ for $c_g \approx c_\gamma$. We include in our calculation the important NLO K-factor for Γ_{gg} of $1+67\alpha_s/(4\pi)$ from Ref. [91] throughout this paper, which shifts the fitted result at O(1) level comparing to tree-level study. We first introduce the "$\Gamma_{\rm min}$" benchmark scenario when the scalar S decay only contain the minimal set of partial widths $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$ and Γ_{gg} necessary for the observed diphoton excess, and additional partial widths of $\Gamma_{Z\gamma}$ and Γ_{ZZ} together equals $0.7\,\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$ when $c_W = 0$. This minimal width is at sub-GeV level for most parameter space we consider. However, the ATLAS observation of the diphoton excess at 13 TeV prefers a large width of around 45 GeV. This motivates us to consider another two benchmark scenario of "$\Gamma = 1$ GeV" as the medium width scenario and "$\Gamma = 45$ GeV" as the large width scenario.

We obtain the production cross section for the scalar by scaling from the heavy SM Higgs production cross section reported by the Higgs cross section working group [92], with appropriate luminosity ratios and loop function factors:

$$\sigma(gg \to S) = \frac{\sigma(gg \to H^{\rm SM}_{750\,\rm GeV})}{\frac{m_H^2}{v^2}|\bar{A}(\frac{m_H^2}{4M^2_{\rm top}})|^2} \times c_g^2, \frac{9}{4}\tilde{c}_g^2 = 55 c_g^2,\ 125\tilde{c}_g^2\ \text{fb}, \tag{2.6}$$

for s, a, respectively. In the $\Gamma_{\rm min}$ scenario, the diphoton branching fraction is

$$\mathrm{Br(S \to \gamma\gamma)} = \frac{\mathrm{c_\gamma^2}}{1.7\ \mathrm{c_\gamma^2} + 2\mathrm{c_g^2}\frac{\alpha_s^2}{\alpha^2}(1+\frac{67}{4\pi}\alpha_s)}, \tag{2.7}$$

which is the same for the pseudoscalar. For the benchmark scenario of $\Gamma = 1$ GeV, 45 GeV, we require physical condition $\Gamma \geq \Gamma_{gg} + 1.7\ \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$. In above equation the factor of 1.7 for the partial width comes from the sum of all $\gamma\gamma$, $Z\gamma$ and ZZ partial widths in the $c_W = 0$ case.

The fitted values of the coefficients of c_g and c_γ ($\tilde{c}_g$ and $\tilde{c}_\gamma$) of the scalar (pseudoscalar) that accommodates the observed 750 GeV diphoton excess are shown in Fig. 2. The green and yellow bands indicate the 68% and 95% confidence band of the fitted cross section, and the solid black line indicates the best fit value. We show in the upper panel of this figure the $\Gamma_{\rm min}$ scenario and lower panel for all three scenarios together in logarithmic scale. Clearly, the vertical band for the $\Gamma_{\rm min}$ scenario corresponds to $\mathrm{Br(S \to \gamma\gamma)}$ dominance, where the value of c_g controls the diphoton rate; the horizontal band for the $\Gamma_{\rm min}$ scenario corresponds to the $\mathrm{Br(S \to gg)}$ dominance, where the value of c_γ controls the diphoton rate. For the scenarios



Figure 2. Fitted values of c_g and c_γ with reference lines represent different VLQ typical models. **Top:** Results assuming $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$. **Bottom:** Results for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ and $\Gamma = 45\,\text{GeV}$ are shown on the same plot. The results for a scalar (c_g) is shown on the lefthand side and the ones for a pseudoscalar ($\tilde{c}_g$) is shown on the righthand side. The green and yellow bands indicate the 68% and 95% confidence band of the fitted cross section, and the solid black line indicates the best fit value. The three different gray shaded region are parameter space excluded by the dijet search for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ and $\Gamma = 45\,\text{GeV}$, from light to dark, respectively. Curves with different colors present the predicted relation for different VLQs (B_R, T_R, $X_R^{5/3}$ and the $(2,2)_{\frac{2}{3}}$ bidoublet).

with $\Gamma = 1$ GeV and 45 GeV, the diagonal bands corresponds to constant $c_g c_\gamma$ that controls

Name	$Q_{\rm em}$ states	$\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}$ Fits with various Γ			
		$\Gamma_{\rm min}$, only gg, $\gamma\gamma$		1 GeV	45 GeV
		c_g	c_γ	c_g	c_g
B_R	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$18.7^{+2.2}_{-2.5}$	$6.24^{+0.74}_{-0.84}$	$42.5^{+2.4}_{-2.9}$	110^{+6}_{-8}
T_R	$\frac{2}{3}$	$4.70^{+0.55}_{-0.63}$	$6.26^{+0.74}_{-0.84}$	$21.2^{+1.2}_{-1.5}$	$55.0^{+3.2}_{-3.8}$
$X_R^{5/3}$	$\frac{5}{3}$	$0.85^{+0.10}_{-0.11}$	$7.06^{+0.83}_{-0.95}$	$8.50^{+0.49}_{-0.59}$	$22.0^{+1.3}_{-1.5}$
Bidoublet	$-\frac{1}{3}\ +\frac{2}{3}\ +\frac{2}{3}\ +\frac{5}{3}$	$2.24^{+0.26}_{-0.30}$	$6.34^{+0.75}_{-0.85}$	$14.6^{+0.8}_{-1.0}$	$37.7^{+2.2}_{-2.6}$
Name	$Q_{\rm em}$ states	$\tilde{c}_g$	$\tilde{c}_\gamma$	$\tilde{c}_g$	$\tilde{c}_g$
B_R	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$12.3^{+1.5}_{-1.6}$	$4.09^{+0.48}_{-0.55}$	$28.1^{+1.6}_{-2.0}$	$72.8^{+4.2}_{-5.1}$
T_R	$\frac{2}{3}$	$3.08^{+0.36}_{-0.41}$	$4.11^{+0.49}_{-0.55}$	$14.1^{+0.8}_{-1.0}$	$36.4^{+2.1}_{-2.5}$
$X_R^{5/3}$	$\frac{5}{3}$	$0.56^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$	$4.63^{+0.55}_{-0.62}$	$5.62^{+0.32}_{-0.39}$	$14.6^{+0.8}_{-1.0}$
Bidoublet	$-\frac{1}{3}\ +\frac{2}{3}\ +\frac{2}{3}\ +\frac{5}{3}$	$1.47^{+0.17}_{-0.20}$	$4.16^{+0.49}_{-0.56}$	$9.64^{+0.55}_{-0.67}$	$25.0^{+1.4}_{-1.7}$

Table 1. The 1σ preferred range on the loop-induced coupling coefficient from the observed diphoton excess for different VLQ cases, which are B_R, T_R, $X_R^{5/3}$ and the $(2,2)_{\frac{2}{3}}$ bidoublet. Here we assume all VLQs are in the fundamental representation of $SU(3)_c$. The results for a scalar (pseudoscalar) resonance are shown on the top (bottom) half of the table. We also show the results for different assumptions on the decay width of the resonance. As in each case $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$ and $c_\gamma(\tilde{c}_\gamma)$ are not independent and for VLQs, it is more convenient to parameterize in terms of $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$. For $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ and $45\,\text{GeV}$ we only show the results for $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$.

the diphoton rate for a fixed total width. We also apply an unavoidable dijet search cross section bound of 3 pb at the 8 TeV LHC [93, 94], shown in Fig. 2 with three different gray shaded regions for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ and $\Gamma = 45\,\text{GeV}$, from light to dark, respectively.

For a given VLQ with certain charge and representation, the value of c_g and c_γ ($\tilde{c}_g$ and $\tilde{c}_\gamma$) are not independent, as predicted by Eq. (2.3) and Eq. (2.4). In Fig. 2 we also show the predicted relations between the two coefficients for VLQs with different charges and representations, each with a curve of a different color. We have chosen a few representative cases: three singlet VLQs with electric charges 1/3, 2/3 and 5/3 (denoted as B_R, T_R and $X_R^{5/3}$, respectively, where the subscript "R" simply indicates them being SM $SU(2)_L$ singlets) and an $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ bidoublet with $U(1)_X$ hypercharge 2/3 (often denoted as $(2,2)_{\frac{2}{3}}$), motivated by natural composite Higgs models [95].[6] These cases represent various possibilities while keeping the analysis relatively simple. It is straight forward to read the constraints on values of both c_g and c_γ ($\tilde{c}_g$ and $\tilde{c}_\gamma$) from the intersection of the curves and the green/yellow bands. We present the 1σ preferred range on the required c_g ($\tilde{c}_g$) in Table 1 for different VLQ

[6] The bidoublet induces none-zero c_W, leading to new decay channels of $S \to WW$ and a sum of all electroweak boson partial widths different to the 1.7 $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$ of the $c_W = 0$ case. For very small c_g (vertical bands in Fig. 2) this will shift the fitted c_g to larger values. Still, as the line for the predicted ratio c_γ/c_g intersects with the $S \to gg$ dominant region (horizontal bands) the fitted values will remain the same and thus we show it on a same plot.

cases. These values are used later in Section 4 for estimating the cutoff scale for different VLQs.

3 Perturbative considerations with RG running

In this section we try to study the RG running of the Yukawa coupling. As discussed in the previous section a large Yukawa coupling between the singlet scalar and VLQ is expected in all scenarios, especially for S with large width. Such large coupling, even if perturbative at scale $\mu = m_S$, is likely to violate perturbativity at nearby scale. This leads to our consideration of the RG running of these couplings. The logic behind is to access the validity of using S and VLQs to explain diphoton excess, and to provide a conservative estimation of the scale of new physics beyond this minimal setup. An important and intuitive modification in the case of large c_g is to introduce multiple (N_f) copies of the VLQ, so as to reduce the required Yukawa coupling for each flavor. We discuss in details the modification associated with such introduction of N_f in both RG running and perturbativity criterion in the following two sections.

To simplify calculation while capturing most of the physics, we assume the scalar or pseudoscalar couples to N_f copies of VLQs with the same masses M and a diagonal Yukawa coupling matrix $y\,\mathbf{I}$ where $\mathbf{I}$ is an $N_f \times N_f$ identity matrix. Using the results from Ref. [96], we obtain the RG equation of the Yukawa coupling y, given by[7]

$$16\pi^2 \frac{dy}{dt} = (3 + 6N_f)\, y^3 - 8g_3^2\, y\,, \tag{3.1}$$

where we have used $N_c = 3$ for the number of colors. We have also ignored the contributions from electroweak gauge bosons, which is a good approximation for the range of VLQ charges ($|Q| \leq 5/3$) considered in this paper. The first term of the righthand side of Eq. (3.1) comes from scalar and fermion loops shown in Fig. 3 and the second term is from gluon loops. For a given scenario one could deduce the required values of c_g and c_γ (or $\tilde{c}_g$ and $\tilde{c}_\gamma$), which can be transformed into the desired value of y at scale $\mu = 750\,\text{GeV}$. We will denote the value of y at scale $\mu = 750\,\text{GeV}$ as y_0 in order to distinguish it from the running value. For convenience, we choose to parameterize y_0 in terms of the coupling to gluons, c_g [8]. Under our assumption, Eq (2.3) reduces to

$$c_g = A\, y_0\, N_f \frac{m_S}{M}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

where we have denoted $\bar{A}_{1/2}(\frac{m_S^2}{4M^2})$ simply as A. Therefore, the initial value of the Yukawa coupling is given by

$$y_0 = \frac{c_g M}{A\, N_f m_S}\,. \tag{3.3}$$

We now proceed to evaluate the cutoff scale as a function of the desired value of c_g. One could obtain an intuitive understanding of the running of y by making a number of

[7] Our current Eq. (3.1) also agrees with the results in Ref. [97, 98].

[8] The same derivation also works for a pseudoscalar with $\tilde{c}_g$.



Figure 3. Feynman diagrams for one loop corrections to the Yukawa coupling y corresponding to the y^3 term in the RG equation of y in Eq. (3.1). The total contribution from the 4 diagrams is proportional to $(3 + 2N_c N_f)\, y^3$, where the dominant contribution is from the last diagram in which the closed fermion loop gives a factor of $N_c N_f$.

approximations. First, we ignore the gluon contribution to the RG running which is small as long as y is sufficiently large. In this case, Eq. (3.1) can be easily solved to give

$$\frac{1}{y_0^2} - \frac{1}{y^2} = \frac{3 + 6N_f}{8\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}\right), \tag{3.4}$$

where y_0 is given by Eq. (3.3) and μ_0 is the initial scale for the running at which $y = y_0$, given by

$$\mu_0 = \begin{cases} m_S & \text{if } M < m_S \\ M & \text{if } M \geq m_S \end{cases}, \tag{3.5}$$

as the running only starts above scale M. To simplify calculation we also assume the cutoff scale Λ is the scale at which $y \to \infty$. A more appropriate definition of the cutoff scale should be the one at which the couplings become non-perturbative, which we will address in the next section. From Eq. (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu_0}\right) &= \frac{8\pi^2}{3 + 6N_f} \left(\frac{A_f N_f m_S}{c_g M}\right)^2 \\ &\approx \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \frac{N_f}{c_g^2} \left(\frac{A_f m_S}{M}\right)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where in the last line we assumed $6N_f \gg 3$. The righthand side of Eq. (3.6) is proportional to $N_f^2 \cdot N_f^{-1} = N_f$, where N_f^2 comes from the fact that increasing N_f reduces the initial Yukawa coupling y_0 needed to obtain a certain value of c_g, and N_f^{-1} comes from the fact that N_f enhances the RG evolution of y. Therefore, a crucial result here is that $\log \Lambda$ is proportional to N_f/c_g^2. A very large N_f helps increase Λ, while a large c_g would force Λ to be small.

4 Implication of new physics scale in various VLQ models

We now move on to a more careful numerical study of the cutoff scale Λ of the minimal theory with the 750 GeV resonance S and VLQs, at which scale the couplings become non-perturbative. We will use a more appropriate definition of the cutoff scale and also include the gluon contribution to the RG evolution of the Yukawa coupling. One usually consider Λ

to be given by the unitarity or perturbativity bound, which is different in descriptions but comes from the same physics origin[9]. One could think of a 4-fermion scattering process with an s-channel S, which has an amplitude proportional to $N_c N_f\, y^2$, where the factor of $N_c N_f$ comes from the sum of final state fermions. One could also think of the same process with a self energy term of S involving fermion loop proportional to $\frac{N_c N_f\, y^2}{(4\pi)^2}$. In both picture, Λ is found be the scale at which $y \sim \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{N_c N_f}}$. Therefore, one would expect a large N_f to be less helpful in terms of increasing the cutoff scale than one would naively expect. Nevertheless, a large N_f still helps increase Λ since y_0 scales as $1/N_f$ for a fixed value of c_g.

The gluon contribution to the RG evolution of y is given by the 2nd term on the righthand side of Eq. (3.1). For large N_f, the required y_0 is small and the gluon contribution could significantly slow down the running of y or even make it run down[10]. However, unless $N_f > 10$, g_3 would decrease as the scale goes up and, depending on the value of y_0, y could either keep on running down or turn around at some point. This means that for small enough c_g or large enough N_f, the theory could be weakly coupled up to very high scales and essentially does not require a cutoff. For example, as we will show later, if S has a minimal total decay width and couples to a charge 5/3 quark, it is possible to have a weakly coupled theory while achieving the desired diphoton excess.

Our results for the cutoff scale Λ as a function of c_g ($\tilde{c}_g$) are shown in Fig. 4 for S being a scalar and Fig. 5 for S being a pseudoscalar, where different curves represent different assumptions on the value of N_f. The cutoff scale has a strong dependence on the mass of the fermion(s), in particular when M is small and the threshold effects become important. To illustrate this, we show the results for two different values of M. For the plots on the left panel, we assume $M = 1\,\text{TeV}$; for the plots on the right panel, we assume $M = 400\,\text{GeV}$, large enough to avoid on-shell decays of S while giving a significant loop factor (1.36 for a scalar and 1.68 for a pseudoscalar). It should be noted that a 400 GeV charged quark with standard production and decays should have already been excluded by the 8 TeV LHC. Still the VLQ could be hidden if it decays in an exotic way due to BSM model construction, similar to the case of hidden scalar top quark. We also show the 1σ preferred ranges on c_g ($\tilde{c}_g$) required to reproduce the observed diphoton excess for the singlet quarks (B_R, T_R and $X_R^{5/3}$ in Table 1), displayed as bands with different colors. The red, green and blue bands correspond to charge 5/3, 2/3 and 1/3 quarks, respectively. We note here that the signs of the charges do not matter for our results. For simplicity, we only consider one type of quark (with N_f copies) at a time, while in principle one could have a mixture of different quarks. The bounds on c_g ($\tilde{c}_g$) also depends crucially on the assumption of the total width of S. In each figure, the plots in the top panel correspond to a minimal total width, while the plots in the middle (bottom) panel correspond to a total width of $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ (45 GeV).

[9] For a discussion on possible separation between the scale of new physics and the scale of perturbativity violation, see Ref. [99].

[10] For some special regions of the parameter space, these couplings could approach an approximate conformal fixed point, leading to possible interesting links to higher scale physics.



Figure 4. The cutoff scale Λ as a function of c_g for different numbers of flavors N_f with $m_S = 750\,\text{GeV}$, for S being a scalar. **Left:** $M = 1\,\text{TeV}$, **Right:** $M = 400\,\text{GeV}$. Different bands corresponds to the 1σ preferred ranges on c_g required to produce the observed diphoton excess for singlet VLQs with different electric charges. The red, green blue bands correspond to charge 5/3, 2/3 and 1/3 quarks, respectively. Different assumptions on the total width of S are considered, which are $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{min}}$ (top panel), $\Gamma = 1\,\text{GeV}$ (middle panel) and $\Gamma = 45\,\text{GeV}$ (bottom panel). The constraints on c_g from the dijet searches are also indicated on the plots, which are $c_g < 15.4,\ 38.5,\ 100$ for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{min}},\ 1\,\text{GeV},\ 45\,\text{GeV}$, respectively.

In Fig. 6, we show the results for the bidoublet quark $(2,2)_{\frac{2}{3}}$, where N_g denotes the number of copies (generations) of the bidoublet. In each plot, the red, green and blue bands



Figure 5. Same as Fig. 4 but for S being a pesudoscalar. The constraints on $\tilde{c}_g$ from the dijet searches are $\tilde{c}_g < 10.1,\ 25.5,\ 66.0$ for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min},\ 1\,{\rm GeV},\ 45\,{\rm GeV}$, respectively.

correspond to the 1σ preferred ranges on c_g to produce the observed diphoton excess assuming $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, $\Gamma = 1\,{\rm GeV}$ and $\Gamma = 45\,{\rm GeV}$, respectively. The plot on the left (right) side corresponds to S being a scalar (pseudoscalar). We only show results for $M = 1\,{\rm TeV}$. The masses of these quarks are already constrained to be above $\sim 800\,{\rm GeV}$ by the 8 TeV LHC results (see *e.g.* Ref. [100]), assuming they decay dominantly to SM particles. Since these quarks are EW doublets, it is very hard, if not impossible, to arrange them to have light masses and simultaneously avoid the LHC constraint. We do not consider this possibility



Figure 6. Same as Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 but for a bidoublet $(2,2)_{\frac{2}{3}}$. N_g denotes the number of copies (generations) of bidoublets. The red, green and blue bands correspond to the 1σ preferred ranges on c_g required to produce the observed diphoton excess assuming $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, $\Gamma = 1\,{\rm GeV}$ and $\Gamma = 45\,{\rm GeV}$, respectively. The plot on the left (right) side corresponds to S being a scalar (pseudoscalar). Note that the blue band is out of the plot ranges due to the required $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$ being very large. The plotted bands are also within the allowed region of $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$ from the dijet search constraints, which are $c_g < 15.4,\ 38.5,\ 100$ (of a scalar) and $\tilde{c}_g < 10.1,\ 25.5,\ 66.0$ (of a pseudoscalar) for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min},\ 1\,{\rm GeV},\ 45\,{\rm GeV}$, respectively.

here.

A large electric charge of the quarks is very helpful to increasing the cutoff scale, as a large charge would greatly enhance c_γ and reduce the required Yukawa coupling. In fact, for $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, having one charge 5/3 quark could make the theory weakly coupled at all scales due to the gluon loop contribution to the running and a small initial Yukawa coupling, as discussed earlier. On the other hand, for a charge 1/3 quark, even with $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rm min}$, the cutoff scale can not be much larger than a few TeV unless there are many copies of it (large N_f). In addition, for charge 1/3 VLQs the required value of $c_g(\tilde{c}_g)$ is already excluded by the dijet searches, regardless of the number of flavors.

Having a pseudoscalar instead of a scalar for the 750 GeV resonance could help increase the cutoff scale for two reasons. First, for a given scenario the required $\tilde{c}_g$ is less than the required c_g (of a scalar) due to a larger contribution from fermion loops. Second, for small M (near the threshold) the loop function of a pseudoscalar is more enhanced than the one of a scalar. A pseudoscalar may also be convenient for other aspects, such as avoiding mixing with the SM Higgs in the CP conserving case.

Another observation here is that if the total width of S is large, it is very hard to increase the cutoff scale. This is because a large total width makes the branching ratio to diphoton very small, and to obtain the desired rate the production cross section needs to be very large. This large production rate requires a large c_g ($\tilde{c}_g$) which in turns requires large Yukawa couplings. Even for $\Gamma = 1\,{\rm GeV}$, it is very hard to make the cutoff much larger than 1 TeV without a combination of large electric charge, large N_f and small M. If the diphoton excess does come from a resonance at around 750 GeV, the measurement of its width is indeed crucial for the

understanding of the underlying new physics.

It is important to realize that the validity of the one loop RG equations becomes questionable near the cutoff scale. This is because of the following two reasons: 1) when the coupling becomes strong, higher order effects become important and the one loop RG equations cease to be good approximations; 2) if the underlying new physics involves some strong dynamics under which S is a composite state, the theory containing S as a degree of freedom is only well-defined much below the cutoff scale at which the composite states form. Therefore, one should not interpret the results in Fig. 4, 5 and 6 literally as the exact value of the cutoff scale given a set of model parameters, since there is no unique and precise definition of the cutoff scale to begin with. Instead, they should only be treated as an estimation of the scale around which one would expect to see additional new physics.

5 Conclusion

While the observed diphoton excess can be most easily explained by a (pseudo)scalar S at around 750 GeV with VLQ loop-induced couplings to gluons and photons, the measured rate implies relatively large Yukawa couplings between S and the VLQ(s). Such large couplings can easily run into perturbativity limit at nearby scale. In this paper, we take a conservative approach and assume no other new physics appear except for the 750 GeV scalar and the VLQ(s) mediating the anomalous couplings. We assess the validity of such setup in various VLQ representations in three different scalar width assumptions, namely the minimal width, a medium width of 1 GeV and a large width of 45 GeV. Most importantly, we estimate the highest scale that the theory is still self-consistent/perturbative, using the tools of RG running. We explore different "methods" of increasing the cutoff scale and find out that introducing multiple copies (N_f) of quarks, quarks with light masses (~ 400 GeV) or large electric charges (5/3) could all help. We point out that while the initial Yukawa coupling can be significantly reduced by a large N_f, the running of the Yukawa will be sensitive to all flavors through the self-energy of the singlet scalar field. In addition, a more comprehensive consideration of perturbativity/unitarity requires the Yukawa coupling to satisfy $y \lesssim 4\pi/\sqrt{N_c N_f}$. These two important N_f factors brings the cutoff scale sooner than one would naively expect. The required cutoff scale also depends crucially on the total width of S. We find that for the $\Gamma_{\rm min}$ case, with a 1 TeV charge 5/3 VLQ with $N_f = 1$, the minimal theory could be weakly coupled at all scales, as the Yukawa couplings runs down due to the gluon loop contribution when its initial value is small enough; for $\Gamma = 45$ GeV, even with 400 GeV charge 5/3 VLQs, one would need at least $N_f \gtrsim 3$ to increase the cutoff scale to ~ 5 TeV.

Our study is based upon very generic setups, and the conclusions are applicable for many variations of beyond standard model physics addressing this diphoton excess. Further studies could reveal other interesting features, for example, in considering a combination of scalar and fermion (including lepton) contributions, other production modes, and potentially a thorough study trying to discover new particles running in the loop. As the data from the 13 TeV LHC accumulates, the diphoton excess is expected to be soon confirmed or ruled out, and in the

former case more measurements could be made, such as the width of the resonance and the rate of other decay modes. We look forward to the upcoming more detailed LHC run2 analysis for this exciting opportunity for new physics.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Haipeng An, Patrick Fox, Peisi Huang, Jack Kearney and Lian-Tao Wang for helpful discussions. Fermilab is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02- 07CH11359 with the United States Department of Energy. JG is supported in part by the Chinese Academy of Science (CAS) International Traveling Award under Grant H95120N1U7. ZL would also like to thank the Center for Future High Energy Physics (CFHEP) in Beijing for its hospitality where part of this work was done.

References

[1] **CMS Collaboration** Collaboration, *Search for new physics in high mass diphoton events in proton-proton collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 13$ *TeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-EXO-15-004, CERN, Geneva, 2015.

[2] *Search for resonances decaying to photon pairs in 3.2* fb^{-1} *of pp collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 13$ *TeV with the ATLAS detector*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2015-081, CERN, Geneva, Dec, 2015.

[3] K. Harigaya and Y. Nomura, *Composite Models for the 750 GeV Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.04850.

[4] Y. Mambrini, G. Arcadi, and A. Djouadi, *The LHC diphoton resonance and dark matter*, arXiv:1512.04913.

[5] M. Backovic, A. Mariotti, and D. Redigolo, *Di-photon excess illuminates Dark Matter*, arXiv:1512.04917.

[6] Y. Nakai, R. Sato, and K. Tobioka, *Footprints of New Strong Dynamics via Anomaly*, arXiv:1512.04924.

[7] D. Buttazzo, A. Greljo, and D. Marzocca, *Knocking on New Physics' door with a Scalar Resonance*, arXiv:1512.04929.

[8] R. Franceschini, G. F. Giudice, J. F. Kamenik, M. McCullough, A. Pomarol, R. Rattazzi, M. Redi, F. Riva, A. Strumia, and R. Torre, *What is the gamma gamma resonance at 750 GeV?*, arXiv:1512.04933.

[9] S. Di Chiara, L. Marzola, and M. Raidal, *First interpretation of the 750 GeV di-photon resonance at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.04939.

[10] A. Angelescu, A. Djouadi, and G. Moreau, *Scenarii for interpretations of the LHC diphoton excess: two Higgs doublets and vector-like quarks and leptons*, arXiv:1512.04921.

[11] S. Knapen, T. Melia, M. Papucci, and K. Zurek, *Rays of light from the LHC*, arXiv:1512.04928.

[12] A. Pilaftsis, *Diphoton Signatures from Heavy Axion Decays at LHC*, arXiv:1512.04931.

[13] J. Ellis, S. A. R. Ellis, J. Quevillon, V. Sanz, and T. You, *On the Interpretation of a Possible* ~ 750 *GeV Particle Decaying into* $\gamma\gamma$, arXiv:1512.05327.

[14] B. Bellazzini, R. Franceschini, F. Sala, and J. Serra, *Goldstones in Diphotons*, arXiv:1512.05330.

[15] R. S. Gupta, S. Jger, Y. Kats, G. Perez, and E. Stamou, *Interpreting a 750 GeV Diphoton Resonance*, arXiv:1512.05332.

[16] E. Molinaro, F. Sannino, and N. Vignaroli, *Minimal Composite Dynamics versus Axion Origin of the Diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.05334.

[17] T. Higaki, K. S. Jeong, N. Kitajima, and F. Takahashi, *The QCD Axion from Aligned Axions and Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.05295.

[18] S. D. McDermott, P. Meade, and H. Ramani, *Singlet Scalar Resonances and the Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.05326.

[19] M. Low, A. Tesi, and L.-T. Wang, *A pseudoscalar decaying to photon pairs in the early LHC run 2 data*, arXiv:1512.05328.

[20] C. Petersson and R. Torre, *The 750 GeV diphoton excess from the goldstino superpartner*, arXiv:1512.05333.

[21] B. Dutta, Y. Gao, T. Ghosh, I. Gogoladze, and T. Li, *Interpretation of the diphoton excess at CMS and ATLAS*, arXiv:1512.05439.

[22] Q.-H. Cao, Y. Liu, K.-P. Xie, B. Yan, and D.-M. Zhang, *A Boost Test of Anomalous Diphoton Resonance at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.05542.

[23] S. Matsuzaki and K. Yamawaki, *750 GeV Diphoton Signal from One-Family Walking Technipion*, arXiv:1512.05564.

[24] A. Kobakhidze, F. Wang, L. Wu, J. M. Yang, and M. Zhang, *LHC 750 GeV diphoton resonance explained as a heavy scalar in top-seesaw model*, arXiv:1512.05585.

[25] P. Cox, A. D. Medina, T. S. Ray, and A. Spray, *Diphoton Excess at 750 GeV from a Radion in the Bulk-Higgs Scenario*, arXiv:1512.05618.

[26] A. Ahmed, B. M. Dillon, B. Grzadkowski, J. F. Gunion, and Y. Jiang, *Higgs-radion interpretation of 750 GeV di-photon excess at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.05771.

[27] P. Agrawal, J. Fan, B. Heidenreich, M. Reece, and M. Strassler, *Experimental Considerations Motivated by the Diphoton Excess at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.05775.

[28] R. Martinez, F. Ochoa, and C. F. Sierra, *Diphoton decay for a* 750 *GeV scalar boson in an* $U(1)'$ *model*, arXiv:1512.05617.

[29] D. Becirevic, E. Bertuzzo, O. Sumensari, and R. Z. Funchal, *Can the new resonance at LHC be a CP-Odd Higgs boson?*, arXiv:1512.05623.

[30] J. M. No, V. Sanz, and J. Setford, *See-Saw Composite Higgses at the LHC: Linking Naturalness to the* 750 *GeV Di-Photon Resonance*, arXiv:1512.05700.

[31] S. V. Demidov and D. S. Gorbunov, *On sgoldstino interpretation of the diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.05723.

[32] W. Chao, R. Huo, and J.-H. Yu, *The Minimal Scalar-Stealth Top Interpretation of the Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.05738.

[33] S. Fichet, G. von Gersdorff, and C. Royon, *Scattering Light by Light at 750 GeV at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.05751.

[34] D. Curtin and C. B. Verhaaren, *Quirky Explanations for the Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.05753.

[35] L. Bian, N. Chen, D. Liu, and J. Shu, *A hidden confining world on the 750 GeV diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.05759.

[36] J. Chakrabortty, A. Choudhury, P. Ghosh, S. Mondal, and T. Srivastava, *Di-photon resonance around 750 GeV: shedding light on the theory underneath*, arXiv:1512.05767.

[37] C. Csaki, J. Hubisz, and J. Terning, *The Minimal Model of a Diphoton Resonance: Production without Gluon Couplings*, arXiv:1512.05776.

[38] A. Falkowski, O. Slone, and T. Volansky, *Phenomenology of a 750 GeV Singlet*, arXiv:1512.05777.

[39] D. Aloni, K. Blum, A. Dery, A. Efrati, and Y. Nir, *On a possible large width 750 GeV diphoton resonance at ATLAS and CMS*, arXiv:1512.05778.

[40] Y. Bai, J. Berger, and R. Lu, *A 750 GeV Dark Pion: Cousin of a Dark G-parity-odd WIMP*, arXiv:1512.05779.

[41] E. Gabrielli, K. Kannike, B. Mele, M. Raidal, C. Spethmann, and H. Veerme, *A SUSY Inspired Simplified Model for the 750 GeV Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.05961.

[42] R. Benbrik, C.-H. Chen, and T. Nomura, *Higgs singlet as a diphoton resonance in a vector-like quark model*, arXiv:1512.06028.

[43] J. S. Kim, J. Reuter, K. Rolbiecki, and R. R. de Austri, *A resonance without resonance: scrutinizing the diphoton excess at 750 GeV*, arXiv:1512.06083.

[44] A. Alves, A. G. Dias, and K. Sinha, *The 750 GeV S-cion: Where else should we look for it?*, arXiv:1512.06091.

[45] E. Megias, O. Pujolas, and M. Quiros, *On dilatons and the LHC diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.06106.

[46] L. M. Carpenter, R. Colburn, and J. Goodman, *Supersoft SUSY Models and the 750 GeV Diphoton Excess, Beyond Effective Operators*, arXiv:1512.06107.

[47] J. Bernon and C. Smith, *Could the width of the diphoton anomaly signal a three-body decay ?*, arXiv:1512.06113.

[48] W. Chao, *Symmetries Behind the 750 GeV Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.06297.

[49] M. T. Arun and P. Saha, *Gravitons in multiply warped scenarios - at 750 GeV and beyond*, arXiv:1512.06335.

[50] C. Han, H. M. Lee, M. Park, and V. Sanz, *The diphoton resonance as a gravity mediator of dark matter*, arXiv:1512.06376.

[51] S. Chang, *A Simple $U(1)$ Gauge Theory Explanation of the Diphoton Excess*, arXiv:1512.06426.

[52] I. Chakraborty and A. Kundu, *Diphoton excess at 750 GeV: Singlet scalars confront naturalness*, arXiv:1512.06508.

[53] R. Ding, L. Huang, T. Li, and B. Zhu, *Interpreting* 750 *GeV Diphoton Excess with R-parity Violation Supersymmetry*, arXiv:1512.06560.

[54] H. Han, S. Wang, and S. Zheng, *Scalar Explanation of Diphoton Excess at LHC*, arXiv:1512.06562.

[55] M.-x. Luo, K. Wang, T. Xu, L. Zhang, and G. Zhu, *Squarkonium/Diquarkonium and the Di-photon Excess*, arXiv:1512.06670.

[56] J. Chang, K. Cheung, and C.-T. Lu, *Interpreting the 750 GeV Di-photon Resonance using photon-jets in Hidden-Valley-like models*, arXiv:1512.06671.

[57] D. Bardhan, D. Bhatia, A. Chakraborty, U. Maitra, S. Raychaudhuri, and T. Samui, *Radion Candidate for the LHC Diphoton Resonance*, arXiv:1512.06674.

[58] T.-F. Feng, X.-Q. Li, H.-B. Zhang, and S.-M. Zhao, *The LHC 750 GeV diphoton excess in supersymmetry with gauged baryon and lepton numbers*, arXiv:1512.06696.

[59] O. Antipin, M. Mojaza, and F. Sannino, *A natural Coleman-Weinberg theory explains the diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.06708.

[60] F. Wang, L. Wu, J. M. Yang, and M. Zhang, *750 GeV Diphoton Resonance, 125 GeV Higgs and Muon g-2 Anomaly in Deflected Anomaly Mediation SUSY Breaking Scenario*, arXiv:1512.06715.

[61] J. Cao, C. Han, L. Shang, W. Su, J. M. Yang, and Y. Zhang, *Interpreting the 750 GeV diphoton excess by the singlet extension of the Manohar-Wise Model*, arXiv:1512.06728.

[62] F. P. Huang, C. S. Li, Z. L. Liu, and Y. Wang, *750 GeV Diphoton Excess from Cascade Decay*, arXiv:1512.06732.

[63] W. Liao and H.-q. Zheng, *Scalar resonance at 750 GeV as composite of heavy vector-like fermions*, arXiv:1512.06741.

[64] J. J. Heckman, *750 GeV Diphotons from a D3-brane*, arXiv:1512.06773.

[65] M. Dhuria and G. Goswami, *Perturbativity, vacuum stability and inflation in the light of 750 GeV diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.06782.

[66] X.-J. Bi, Q.-F. Xiang, P.-F. Yin, and Z.-H. Yu, *The 750 GeV diphoton excess at the LHC and dark matter constraints*, arXiv:1512.06787.

[67] J. S. Kim, K. Rolbiecki, and R. R. de Austri, *Model-independent combination of diphoton constraints at 750 GeV*, arXiv:1512.06797.

[68] L. Berthier, J. M. Cline, W. Shepherd, and M. Trott, *Effective interpretations of a diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.06799.

[69] W. S. Cho, D. Kim, K. Kong, S. H. Lim, K. T. Matchev, J.-C. Park, and M. Park, *The 750 GeV Diphoton Excess May Not Imply a 750 GeV Resonance*, arXiv:1512.06824.

[70] J. M. Cline and Z. Liu, *LHC diphotons from electroweakly pair-produced composite pseudoscalars*, arXiv:1512.06827.

[71] M. Bauer and M. Neubert, *Flavor Anomalies, the Diphoton Excess and a Dark Matter Candidate*, arXiv:1512.06828.

[72] M. Chala, M. Duerr, F. Kahlhoefer, and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, *Tricking Landau-Yang: How to obtain the diphoton excess from a vector resonance*, arXiv:1512.06833.

[73] K. Kulkarni, *Extension of νMSM model and possible explanations of recent astronomical and collider observations*, arXiv:1512.06836.

[74] D. Barducci, A. Goudelis, S. Kulkarni, and D. Sengupta, *One jet to rule them all: monojet constraints and invisible decays of a 750 GeV diphoton resonance*, arXiv:1512.06842.

[75] S. M. Boucenna, S. Morisi, and A. Vicente, *The LHC diphoton resonance from gauge symmetry*, arXiv:1512.06878.

[76] C. W. Murphy, *Vector Leptoquarks and the 750 GeV Diphoton Resonance at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.06976.

[77] A. E. C. Hernndez and I. Nisandzic, *LHC diphoton 750 GeV resonance as an indication of $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_L \times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry*, arXiv:1512.07165.

[78] U. K. Dey, S. Mohanty, and G. Tomar, *750 GeV resonance in the Dark Left-Right Model*, arXiv:1512.07212.

[79] G. M. Pelaggi, A. Strumia, and E. Vigiani, *Trinification can explain the di-photon and di-boson LHC anomalies*, arXiv:1512.07225.

[80] J. de Blas, J. Santiago, and R. Vega-Morales, *New vector bosons and the diphoton excess*, arXiv:1512.07229.

[81] A. Belyaev, G. Cacciapaglia, H. Cai, T. Flacke, A. Parolini, and H. Ser?dio, *Singlets in Composite Higgs Models in light of the LHC di-photon searches*, arXiv:1512.07242.

[82] P. S. B. Dev and D. Teresi, *Asymmetric Dark Matter in the Sun and the Diphoton Excess at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.07243.

[83] W.-C. Huang, Y.-L. S. Tsai, and T.-C. Yuan, *Gauged Two Higgs Doublet Model confronts the LHC 750 GeV di-photon anomaly*, arXiv:1512.07268.

[84] Y. Hamada, T. Noumi, S. Sun, and G. Shiu, *An O(750) GeV Resonance and Inflation*, arXiv:1512.08984.

[85] J. Jaeckel, M. Jankowiak, and M. Spannowsky, *LHC probes the hidden sector*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **2** (2013) 111–117, [arXiv:1212.3620].

[86] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, R. Benbrik, S. Heinemeyer, and M. Prez-Victoria, *Handbook of vectorlike quarks: Mixing and single production*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013), no. 9 094010, [arXiv:1306.0572].

[87] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane, and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide*, *Front. Phys.* **80** (2000) 1–448.

[88] R. Huo, *Standard Model Effective Field Theory: Integrating out Vector-Like Fermions*, *JHEP* **09** (2015) 037, [arXiv:1506.00840].

[89] W. Altmannshofer, J. Galloway, S. Gori, A. L. Kagan, A. Martin, and J. Zupan, *On the 750 GeV di-photon excess*, arXiv:1512.07616.

[90] I. Low and J. Lykken, *Implications of Gauge Invariance on a Heavy Diphoton Resonance*, arXiv:1512.09089.

[91] A. Djouadi, *The Anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. I: The Higgs boson in the standard model*, *Phys. Rept.* **457** (2008) 1–216, [hep-ph/0503172].

[92] **LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group** Collaboration, S. Dittmaier et al., *Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 1. Inclusive Observables*, arXiv:1101.0593.

[93] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad et al., *Search for new phenomena in the dijet mass distribution using $p-p$ collision data at $\sqrt{s}=8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015), no. 5 052007, [arXiv:1407.1376].

[94] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan et al., *Search for resonances and quantum black holes using dijet mass spectra in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s}=8$ TeV*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015), no. 5 052009, [arXiv:1501.04198].

[95] R. Contino, L. Da Rold, and A. Pomarol, *Light custodians in natural composite Higgs models*, *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 055014, [hep-ph/0612048].

[96] M.-x. Luo, H.-w. Wang, and Y. Xiao, *Two loop renormalization group equations in general gauge field theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 065019, [hep-ph/0211440].

[97] M. Son and A. Urbano, *A new scalar resonance at 750 GeV: Towards a proof of concept in favor of strongly interacting theories*, arXiv:1512.08307.

[98] F. Goertz, J. F. Kamenik, A. Katz, and M. Nardecchia, *Indirect Constraints on the Scalar Di-Photon Resonance at the LHC*, arXiv:1512.08500.

[99] U. Aydemir, M. M. Anber, and J. F. Donoghue, *Self-healing of unitarity in effective field theories and the onset of new physics*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 014025, [arXiv:1203.5153].

[100] **CMS** Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan et al., *Search for top-quark partners with charge 5/3 in the same-sign dilepton final state*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014), no. 17 171801, [arXiv:1312.2391].